

geniculata without a generic name, but I presume this will be taken care of elsewhere. I see no need for a neotype. Brinck (1949) was able to settle the identity of *P. fusca* without it."

Prof. G. G. Simpson (25.viii.67): "That two genera have been united under the single name *Leuctra* is a zoological, not nomenclatural, conclusion already reached in 1841. This proposal asks that the name be restricted to what is plainly (and has been since 1838) the wrong genus. It also seems to leave *Leuctra*, correctly and strictly speaking, without a name."

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for names placed on Official Lists by the Ruling given in the present Opinion:

fusca, *Phryganea*, Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) 1 : 549

Leuctra Stephens, 1835, *Ill. Brit. Ent.* 6 : 144.

CERTIFICATE

I certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (67)29 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that Voting Paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 836.

W. E. CHINA

Acting Secretary

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

London

31 October 1967

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED SUPPRESSION OF *CHARAXES JOCASTE* BUTLER (LEPIDOPTERA). (Z.N.(S.) 1806) (see volume 24, pages 255-256)

By Curtis W. Sabrosky (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.)

Proposed use of the plenary powers in this case evades the real question, and the matter of principle involved, as to whether *Charaxes iocaste* Butler, 1865 (not *jocaste* as stated in the title of the application, in the proposals on p. 256, and elsewhere in discussion) is or is not an available name under the circumstances of the 1865 publication. I believe that this point should be faced squarely. If the name be judged unavailable, then use of the plenary powers would be unnecessary; if it be judged available, then the Plenary Powers may be invoked.

If one were to regard a group (sectional) description as making available any included nude species-group name, why then would not the mere combination with a previously described generic name likewise furnish, by association-indication, a similar group (generic) description? Rules stretched too far lose definition and precision. I prefer to regard *C. iocaste* Butler, 1865, as unavailable, it being without description or diagnosis of its own.